

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

0001/002

MAY 16 2008

60,469-255
PA-000.05304-US**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant: Hame, Markus, et al.
Serial Number: 10/569,169
Filed: 02/27/2006
Group Art Unit: 3651
Examiner: Singh, Kavel
Title: PASSENGER CONVEYOR DRIVE MONITORING
ARRANGEMENT WITH BRAKE ACTUATION

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This paper is responsive to the Final Office Action mailed on March 18, 2008. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application.

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103 are based on the *Saito* reference. The Examiner appears to be overlooking the fact that the *Saito* reference is silent regarding any determination whether wheels associated with a drive member of a passenger conveyor drive assembly rotate at the same speed or whether there is any relative rotation between them. The "monitor device 30" does not provide any indication of relative rotation between the wheels 18 and 19 of the *Saito* reference. The function of the controller 30 in the *Saito* reference is described in column 3, lines 55-64, and column 4, lines 5-12. The operation controller 30 of the *Saito* reference receives data regarding the rotating speed of the motor 22. If necessary, the operation controller 30

60,469-255
PA-000.05304-US

receives a load signal indicating the detected current of the motor 22. The controller 30 produces a signal for closing the contacts 10V and 10VX or for closing the contacts 101 or the contacts 102.

There is nothing about any of that information provided to the controller 30 or the contact controls implemented by the controller 30 that in any way has anything to do with a relative rotation between the wheels 18 and 19 of the *Saito* reference. Whether those two wheels are rotating at the same speed or not is entirely outside the scope of any information provided to the controller 30. Therefore, it is impossible to interpret the *Saito* reference as suggested by the Examiner and there is no *prima facie* case of anticipation or obviousness against any of Applicants' claims.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that the subject matter of claim 26 is allowable. For the reasons above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS

By: 

David J. Gaskey, Reg. No. 37,139
400 W. Maple Rd., Ste. 350
Birmingham, MI 48009
(248) 988-8360

Dated: May 16, 2008

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE

I hereby certify that this Request for Reconsideration, relative to Application Serial No. 10/569,169, is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office (Fax No. (571) 273-8800) on May 16, 2008.


Theresa M. Palmateer

N:\Clients\OTIS ELEVATOR\IP00255\PATENT\Request for Reconsideration 5-08.doc